UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,877	02/24/2004	Mitsuo Fukuda	9694D-000002/US	8672
30593 7590 02/26/2007 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910			EXAMINER	
			KOTINI, PAVITRA	
RESTON, VA 20195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
•				
SHORTENED STATUTORY	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/784,877	FUKUDA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Pavitra Kotini	3731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status	·	•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Fe	ebruary 2004.					
	action is non-final.					
· <u>-</u>						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-10,16,18-22 and 24-26</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6,7,11-15,17 and 23</u> is/are objected to.						
<u> </u>	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Evominor				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)    Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/22/06, 5/16/05, 2/24/04.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ate				

Art Unit: 3731

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claim 2 recites that the descending region area monotonically increases and the ascending region area monotonically decrease away from the point. This is opposite of what is set forth in claim 1 and in the specification

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bays et al. (US-4924865).

Bays discloses in one embodiment a first ascending region (18), a descending region (17), and a second ascending region (18) subsequently and integrally formed of biodegradable material (col.3, lines 8-10), extending from a point in a predetermined direction; wherein said first and second ascending regions have the largest cross

**Art Unit: 3731** 

section having substantially the same size and shape to each other (ascending region 18 is substantially the same along the entire structure).

Bays does not disclose the above embodiment to have a triangular cross section. However, the embodiment of figure 6 shows each of said regions having triangular cross sections taken along any planes perpendicular to the predetermined direction; said first and second ascending regions having the triangular cross sections of which area monotonically increases as being away from the point (fig. 7); and said descending region having the triangular cross sections of which area monotonically decreases as being away from the point (section 17 decrease in area away from the point and creates a waist). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the frusto-concial shape of the first embodiment to have a triangular shape as taught in the embodiment of figures 6 and 7 (col.6, lines 51-63).

Regarding **claim 10 and 26**, a holding region (15) of biodegradable material (col.5, line 37) connected to said second ascending region (fig. 3).

Regarding **claim 16**, at least one groove (13) extending in the predetermined direction through at least one of said first and second ascending regions and descending region (fig. 3).

Claim 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bays et al. (US-4924865)

Bays discloses a first ascending region (18), a descending region (17), and a second ascending region (18) subsequently and integrally formed of biodegradable material (col.3, lines 8-10), extending from a point in a predetermined direction; wherein

Art Unit: 3731

said first and second ascending regions have the largest cross section having substantially the same size and shape to each other (ascending region 18 is substantially the same along the entire structure), said first and second ascending regions having the cross sectional area of which monotonically increases as being away from the point (fig. 7); and said descending region having cross sectional area of which monotonically decreases as being away from the point (section 17 decrease in area away from the point and creates a waist).

Bays does not disclose s trapezoidal cross section taken along any plane perpendicular to the predetermined direction. The instant disclosure describes this parameter as merely providing a sharp penetration point and does not describe it as contributing any unexpected result, providing any advantage over other designs, or solves a stated problem to a tissue penetrating device.

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with a triangular or pyramidal cross-section because regardless of the shape, the penetration of a triangular or trapezoidal shaped lancet would achieve the same function or effect of repeatedly incising the peripheral cells and wedging away the intact tissue by the ascending regions and releasing the frictional forces with the peripheral cells by the descending regions. Also, as the specification states, both shapes would minimize pain to the patient by returning the peripheral cells to their original position. As such this parameter is deemed a matter of design choice (lacking in any criticality) and well within the skill of

Art Unit: 3731

the ordinary artisan, obtained through routine experimentation in determining optimum results.

Claims 3-5, 8, 9, 20-22, 24, 25, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bays et al. Bays discloses the claimed invention except for values of the cross-section areas and the increasing rates (or slopes). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include precise values of the slope rates of the ascending and descending areas and the cross-sectional areas of theses sections. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 7, 11-15, 17 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pavitra Kotini whose telephone number is 571-272-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am to 6:00pm.

Art Unit: 3731

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Anhtuan Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PK

AU 3731

2/12/07

ANHTUANT. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED

Page 6

2/19/07